



---

Filofey and His Epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich

Author(s): Nikolay Andreyev

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 38, No. 90 (Dec., 1959), pp. 1-31

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4205118>

Accessed: 12/06/2014 20:33

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# Filofey and his Epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich

NIKOLAY ANDREYEV

## I

OF late, the theory of Moscow the Third Rome has come to be mentioned more and more frequently in connection with the history of Russian thought. Sometimes it has served as a foundation for sweeping generalisation<sup>1</sup> and has certainly become obligatory in any course of Russian history.<sup>2</sup> But while its basic tenets have been sufficiently explained and are unlikely to require any radical revaluation, and while the emotions and consequences to which it gave rise are now apparent, the circumstances of its formulation in Muscovite Russia are still not altogether clear. Undoubtedly, the theory served to invest the rising power of Moscow with greatly increased spiritual authority

<sup>1</sup> P. N. Milyukov, *Ocherki po istorii russkoy kul'tury*, 3 vols, Paris, 1931 (Jubilee edition), II, pt. I, III, pp. 25-7, 50-59; N. Berdyayev, *Russkaya Ideya*, Paris, 1946, pp. 11-13, and *Istoki i smysl russkogo kommunizma*, Paris, 1955, pp. 9-11; V. V. Zenkovsky, *Istoriya russkoy filosofii*, 2 vols, Paris, 1948, I, pp. 41-8; Oleksander Ogloblin, *Moskovs'ka teoriya III Rimu v XVI-XVII stol.*, Munich, 1951 (*N.B.* This, and the following five books are published under the auspices of the Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainians in Western Europe [Praci chleniv Tserkovno-Arkheografichnoi Komisii Apostol's'kogo Vizitatora dlya Ukrainciv u Zakhidniy Evropi]; Nataliya Vasilenko-Polons'ka, *Teoriya III Rimu v Rossii protyagom XVIII ta XIX storich*, Munich 1952; Boris Krupnic'kiy, *Teoriya III Rimu i shlyachi rossiyskoy istoriografii*, Munich, 1952; Vasil' Grishko, *Istorichno-pravne pidgrunttya teorii III Rimu*, Munich, 1953; Hans Koch, *Teoriya III Rimu v istorii vidnovlenogo Moskov's'kogo Patriyakhatu*, Munich, 1953; Ivan Mirchuk, *Istorichno-ideologichni osnovi Teorii III Rimu*, Munich, 1954; A. V. Kartashov, *Vozrozdanie Syatoy Rusi*, Paris, 1956, pp. 29-48; N. Ul'yanov, 'Kompleks Filofeya' (*Novyy Zhurnal*, XLV, New York, 1956, pp. 249-73); M. Karpovich, 'Kommentarii. I. O russkom messianstve' (*ibid*, pp. 274-83) and 'Yeshcho o russkom messianisme' (*ibid*, LIV, 1958, pp. 271-89); Cyril Toumanoff, 'Caesaropapism in Byzantium and Russia' (*Theological Studies*, VII, 2, 1946, pp. 213-43. Published by the Theological Faculties of the Society of Jesus in the United States); P. Giuseppe Olšr S.J., 'Gli ultimi Rurikidi e le basi ideologiche della sovranità dello Stato Russo' (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XII, 1-2, Rome, 1946, pp. 322-73); Cyril Toumanoff, 'Moscow the Third Rome: Genesis and Significance of a Politico-Religious Idea' (*The Catholic Historical Review*, Washington, 1955, pp. 411-47); Karl Schwarzenberg, *Adler und Drache: Der Weltherrschaftsgedanke*, Vienna-Munich, 1958, pp. 227-34; Fedor Stepun, *Der Bolschewismus und die christliche Existenz*, Munich, 1959, cf. chapter VI: 'Moskau, das Dritte Rom, und die Dritte Internationale. Zum Problem des russischen Caesaropapismus'; D. Strémooukhoff, 'L'idée impériale à Moscou au XVI siècle' (*Annales de la Faculté des Lettres d'Aix*, XXXII, 1959, pp. 165-84).

<sup>2</sup> E. F. Shmurlo, *Istoriya Rossii*, Munich, 1920, pp. 116, 121-6; P. Milioukov, Ch. Seignobos, et L. Eisenmann, *Histoire de Russie*, 3 vols, Paris, 1932, I, pp. 142-4; N. I. Shatagin, *Russkoye gosudarstvo v pervoy polovine XVI veka*, Sverdlovsk, 1941, pp. 29-34; Elie Denissoff, 'Aux origines de l'église russe autocéphale' (*Revue des Etudes Slaves*, XXIII, Paris, 1947, pp. 66-88); Pierre Kovalevsky, *Manuel d'Histoire Russe*, Paris, 1948, p. 119; A. M. Ammann, *Abriß der Ostslawischen Kirchen Geschichte*, Vienna, 1950, pp. 165-6; M. T. Florinsky, *Russia*, 2 vols, New York, 1953, I, pp. 164 *et seq.*; S. G. Pushkarev, *Obzor russkoy istorii*, New York, 1953, pp. 141-3; Igor Smolitsch, *Russisches Mönchtum*, Augsburg, 1953, pp. 129-134; G. Vernadsky, *A History of Russia*, New Haven, 1954, 4th ed., pp. 108-9; *Ocherki istorii SSSR. Period feodalizma. Konets XV—nachalo XVII vv.* Ed. A. N. Nasonov, L. V. Cherepnin, A. A. Zimin, AN SSSR, Moscow, 1955, pp. 9, 169-72; Yuliya Sazonova, *Istoriya russkoy literatury, Drevniy period*, 2 vols, New York, II, 1955, pp. 271-3.

although it did not find direct expression in the actual political practice of the Muscovite state.<sup>3</sup> It is doubly curious that although it did much to affirm the autocratic power of the Muscovite grand dukes and of the tsars, it had close links with republican Pskov in that it was formulated and, to a certain extent, popularised by the Elder Filofey, a monk of the Eleazarov monastery in Pskovia. The usual explanation for this seeming anomaly is that Filofey belonged to the pro-Muscovite party in Pskov.<sup>4</sup> But while basically correct, this explanation leaves much unsaid.

What exactly prompted the Pskovian elder to arm Moscow and Muscovite autocracy with a proud ideology and with the magnificent formula: 'Two Romes have fallen, the Third stands, there shall be no Fourth'? And when, precisely, did he first give expression to this theory? It is the aim of this article to elucidate these points further and to try to shed more light on the concrete and pragmatic features of Filofey's activities both as a writer and as a thinker of 16th-century Russia.

V. N. Malinin's lengthy book on Filofey, which prints his epistles, has hitherto been generally accepted as the most detailed research to date into Filofey's activities.<sup>5</sup> It is, therefore, not surprising that successive historians have usually made use of Malinin's conclusions when dealing with one or other aspect of the theory of Moscow as the Third Rome.<sup>6</sup> More particularly, the dates which Malinin assigns to Filofey's epistles have seldom been queried.<sup>7</sup> This question

<sup>3</sup> D. S. Likhachov (*Natsional'noye Samosoznaniye Drevney Rusi*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1945, p. 100) is correct in his evaluation of the theory. He denies its messianic interpretation. The author cannot agree with N. S. Chayev's deductions in 'Moskva -Tretiy Rim v politicheskoy praktike Moskovskogo pravitel'stva' (*Istoricheskiye Zapiski*, AN SSSR, XVII, 1945).

<sup>4</sup> N. N. Maslennikova, the author of one of the most recent works on this subject, considers it reasonable to call Filofey 'the ideologist of the adherents of the union of Pskov with Moscow' in her article 'Ideologicheskaya bor'ba v pskovskoy literature v period obrazovaniya russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva' (*Trudy otdela drevnerusskoy literatury*, Moscow-Leningrad, VIII, 1951, pp. 189-203, abr. *Bor'ba*).

N. I. Serebryansky, 'Ocherki po istorii monashestva v Pskovskoy zemle' (*Chiteniya v obshchestve lyubitel'ey istorii i drevnostey rossiyskikh pri Moskovskom universite, CCXXVI i CCXXVII*, Moscow, 1908, p. 490), considered that politically Filofey was strongly pro-Muscovite (abr. *Ocherki*).

<sup>5</sup> V. N. Malinin, *Starets Eleazarova Monastyrya Filofey i yego poslaniya. Istoriko-literaturnoye issledovaniye*, Kiev, 1901, pp. 768 (text), 106 (notes), 144 (appendices). A bibliography is given on pp. 62-78 (text); cf. also V. I. Ikonnikov, *Opyt russkoy istoriografii*, 2 vols, Kiev, 1908, II, pp. 782, 820-7; E. F. Shmurlo, *Spornyye i nevyasnyonnyye voprosy russkoy istorii. Kurs russkoy istorii*, 3 vols, Prague, 1934, II, pt. 2, pp. 147 et seq., 156 et seq., 167 et seq.; Hildegard Schaefer, *Moskau das Dritte Rom*, Darmstadt, 1957 (2nd ed.), pp. 172-97; and Ya. S. Lur'ye, 'Vopros ob ideologicheskikh dvizheniyakh kontsa XV—nachala XVI v. v nauchnoy literature' (*Trudy otdela drevne-russkoy literatury*, XV, 1958, pp. 131-52). Since 1901 several further manuscript copies of Filofey's works have been found, none of them, however, previously unknown and none of them containing important variants. Cf. N. N. Maslennikova, *Prisoyedineniye Pskova k russkomu tsentral'nomu gosudarstvu*, Leningrad, 1955, pp. 166-7 (abr. *Prisoyedineniye*).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. for instance N. Zernov, *Moscow the Third Rome*, London, 1938, p. 36, who refers to Malinin's book as the 'best account' on the subject and uses it as his main source.

<sup>7</sup> Of primary interest to this study are those works of Filofey in which he formulates his theory of Moscow the Third Rome, i.e.: The epistle to the Grand Duke Vasily III

of the accuracy of the chronology is of particular importance since the dating of a historical event often helps towards a correct assessment of its significance.

There is a strong probability that the now traditional assumption, first advanced by Malinin, that Filofey's epistle to the Tsar and Grand Duke Ivan Vasil'yevich was written to Ivan IV is wrong, and that the epistle was, in fact, addressed to Ivan III. Should this supposition be correct, it would entail a reassessment of Filofey's theory, of its progressive development, and of the modifications in Filofey's views. The supposition is not new. It was put forward at the end of the last century by M. A. D'yakonov;<sup>8</sup> and I. U. Budovnits noted in 1947 (unfortunately without advancing any arguments to support his contention) that the possibility that the epistle was written to Ivan III could not be excluded.<sup>9</sup> In 1951 O. Ogloblin raised the question again. He concluded that the epistle was addressed to Ivan III and was written between 1504 and 1505. But he did not seek to establish the causes underlying Filofey's action and confined himself rather to the range of problems indicated by Malinin: for this reason, as we shall see, he too misdated the epistle. Basically, however, he was perfectly correct in his rejection of Malinin's assumption that the epistle was addressed to Ivan IV.<sup>10</sup>

On the other hand, N. N. Maslennikova, also writing in 1951, implicitly accepted Malinin's chronology and assessed all the available material in the light of Malinin's explanation of how Filofey gradually developed the theme of Moscow the Third Rome:

The idea of Moscow the Third Rome is first expressed by Filofey in his epistle to the Grand Duke Vasily Ivanovich. It is put more clearly in the epistle to Misyur' Munekhin and, finally, in its most detailed form, in the letter to Ivan Vasil'yevich. This is the order in which the epistles were written, and in them his ideas about the causes of the downfall of the two previous Romes were developed and amplified.<sup>11</sup>

(Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix IX, pp. 49–56); the epistle to the grand ducal d'yak Misyur' Munekhin (Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix VII, pp. 37–47); the epistle to the Tsar and Grand Duke Ivan Vasil'yevich (Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix X, pp. 57–66). Malinin (*op. cit.*, p. 373) dates the first 1510 and the second (*ibid.* p. 269) 1524. The third was not given a definite date (Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 374–82, 440–91, 645–58, etc.). As will be seen Malinin attributed it to the period of the reign of Ivan IV not so much from the historical point of view as from the literary, i.e. the development of forms and ideas. Malinin returns several times to this—the weakest link in his argument—and attempts to prove that the epistle was written during Ivan IV's minority and before 1546.

<sup>8</sup> M. A. D'yakonov, *Vlast' Moskovskikh Gosudarey. Ocherki iz istorii politicheskikh idey Drevney Rusi do kontsa XVI veka*, St Petersburg, 1889, p. 67, n. I. D'yakonov expresses doubts as to the verisimilitude of the dates given by V. N. Malinin in his article 'Starets Eleazarova monastyrja, Filofey i yego poslaniye k tsaryu i velikomu knyazyu Ivanu Vasil'yevichu' (*Trudy Kievskoy Duhovnoy Akademii*, 1888, May, pp. 72–126, abr. *Malinin II*).

<sup>9</sup> I. U. Budovnits, *Russkaya publicistika XVI veka*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1947, p. 170.

<sup>10</sup> Ogloblin, *op. cit.*, pp. 25–9.

<sup>11</sup> Maslennikova, *Bor'ba*, p. 190. Maslennikova also devotes some attention to Filofey in *Prisoyedineniye*, pp. 151–67. The publication date of this book is given as 1955, but it

W. Medlin, the American historian, inclines to the theory that the epistle was addressed to Ivan IV, basing his opinion on Malinin's conclusions.<sup>12</sup> D. Strémooukhoff, the author of a most interesting work on the origin of the Moscow the Third Rome theory, also writes:

We admit, though not without hesitation, that the fragment called the Epistle of Philotheus to the Tsar Ivan Vasil'evich does in fact contain a passage which may be held to justify its claim to this title and is addressed to Ivan IV.<sup>13</sup>

Hildegard Schaeder,<sup>14</sup> in the second edition of her *Moskau das Dritte Rom*, emphasises 'the careful analysis of the source material and chronology' in Maslennikova's work. In the first edition of her book, she had relied on Malinin's conclusions (which Maslennikova simply appears to have paraphrased), and thus ranges herself on the side of Malinin's chronology.

This synopsis of the most important works on the subject shows that doubts clearly exist as to the accuracy of Malinin's chronology and are admitted by some authors. In order to make a full analysis of Malinin's reasoning, his arguments must first be examined in relation to the details available about Filofey himself.

## II

Filofey is referred to in the original sources sometimes as a monk and sometimes as an elder of the Eleazarov monastery.<sup>15</sup> The only sources for the early history of the monastery are the two versions of the 'Life' of its founder, the Blessed Yevfrosin. Malinin, after a careful study of the first version of the 'Life' written, he considered, before 1505, could find no reference to the monk Filofey. He concluded that when the first version of the 'Life' was written Filofey was not yet well-known and that, therefore, he did not write his famous epistle during the reign of Ivan III, who died in 1505.<sup>16</sup> However, must have been finished at the very beginning of 1953, judging by D. S. Likhachov's introduction as editor and also by the absence from the bibliography of works published later than 1952, with one exception on p. 51. The author's basic idea is the same as in the article *Bor'ba* which the book repeats in part word for word.

<sup>12</sup> 'There is some doubt as to whether this epistle was actually addressed to Tsar Ivan or to the Grand Prince Ivan III (called Tsar by the clergy). The document itself is silent but its contents suggest that it is of a later date than that written to Vasily III (1511) and its tenor fits best the beginning of Tsar Ivan IV's reign', William K. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome, A political study of the relations of church and state in Muscovite Russia*, Geneva, 1952, p. 95.

<sup>13</sup> Dimitri Strémooukhoff, 'Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine' (*Speculum*, Cambridge, Mass., XXVIII, I, January, 1953, p. 98, n. 82).

<sup>14</sup> Schaeder, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

<sup>15</sup> The monastery was founded in the second half of the 15th century and derived its name from the Blessed Yevfrosin, the founder, whose name, before he became a monk, was Eleazar. Smolitsch, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>16</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 376-7.

as N. Serebryansky, the editor of the original version of the 'Life of the Blessed Yevfrosin of Pskov',<sup>17</sup> pointed out: 'Judging by its content, the version edited here is not a hagiography in the generally accepted sense but a special tract in defense of the twofold alleluia.'<sup>18</sup> Serebryansky further considers that this 'Tale of the most holy alleluia' was probably composed after 1505 and certainly not later than 1510. Its author was neither a man of Pskov nor a monk of the Eleazarov monastery, for the work contains too many inaccuracies to have been written by anyone familiar with Pskov or with the monastery itself. Serebryansky assumes that it was written in one of the Novgorod monasteries.<sup>19</sup> His detailed analysis, which was written after Malinin's, completely undermines Malinin's argument in that it offers an indirect but perfectly satisfactory explanation of the lack of reference to Filofey in the first version of the 'Life'. The second version, written in 1547 by the Presbyter Vasily (who took the name of Varlaam when he became a monk), was also written with a special purpose in view: to secure the canonisation of the monastery's founder.<sup>20</sup> Thus there was equally no reason why the Elder Filofey should have been mentioned in this second version of the 'Life' of the Blessed Yevfrosin.

Malinin did, however, find one reference to an Abbot Filofey in the second version.<sup>21</sup> The question naturally arose whether this abbot was the Filofey who propagated the idea of Moscow the Third Rome. Malinin thought that he was and, presumably, this was indeed so. From what is known of Filofey's biography there is nothing inconsistent with such a supposition.

Certain conclusions about Filofey's birth and education can be drawn from his epistle to the grand-ducal *d'yak* in Pskov, Mikhail Grigor'yevich Misyur' Munekhin,<sup>22</sup> in which he writes with deliberate humility:

<sup>17</sup> N. I. Serebryansky, 'Zhitiye prepodobnogo Yevfrosina Pskovskogo (Pervonachal'-nayaredaktsiya)' (*Pamyatniki drevney pis'mennosti i iskusstva*, St Petersburg, 1909, CLXXXIII).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. xvii-xviii.

<sup>20</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9. Yevfrosin was actually canonised at the council in Moscow in 1549. Cf. Ye. Golubinsky, *Istoriya kanonizatsii svyatykh v russkoy tserkvi*, 2nd edition, Moscow, 1903, pp. 103-4.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 32-3. Abbot Filofey is mentioned in connection with a miracle in which a blinded robber, Vasily Narrow Eyes (*Tesnyye Ochi*), recovered his sight and, becoming a monk, 'took on angelic form [a monk's habit] from the shepherd of this cloister'.

<sup>22</sup> Mikhail Grigor'yevich Misyur' Munekhin was grand-ducal *d'yak* in Pskov under the *namesniki* for over 17 years, from 24 January 1510 to 11 March 1528. Thanks to his enlightened outlook, wide knowledge, and statesmanship, he played a most important part in Pskovia, where he enjoyed the fullest plenary powers from the grand duke, including even the right to negotiate with foreign ambassadors (*Pskovskkiye Letopisi*, I, ed. by A. Nasonov, Moscow-Leningrad, 1941, p. 102, under the years 1521-3, abr. *P.L.*). For Munekhin's personality and activities in the sphere of ecclesiastical politics see N. Andreyev 'The Pskov-Pechery Monastery in the 16th century' (*The Slavonic and East European Review*, XXXII, 79, 1954, pp. 318-20, 322-3).

Malinin (*op. cit.*, text pp. 159-61, notes pp. 16-17, n. 587) considered him to have been of Tartar origin, presuming that Mikhail Gireyev, the treasurer, and the *d'yak* Munekhin were one and the same person. That Gireyev and Munekhin were the same person was



And it is known to you, Lord, that I am a countryman and an ignorant person (*nevezha*) in scholarship, [that] I was not born in Athens nor did I learn from learned philosophers, nor did I ever have occasion to dispute with learned philosophers: I have learned from books of holy law, by which I desired to save my sinful soul and to escape eternal torment.<sup>23</sup>

Some expressions, such as *nevezha*, and the reference to Athens and to philosophers, echo similar phrases in the 'Life of Stefan of Perm', written by Epifany the Wise.<sup>24</sup> Such phrases—rather ornate and solemn in the spirit of the prevalent literary manner of Russian ecclesiastical writers of that time—are, to some extent, illustrative of Filofey's style. They also indicate a comparatively wide knowledge of ecclesiastical literature, which suggests that Filofey must have become a monk at an early age. The methodical clarity of his work and his gift of precise, factual exposition would similarly suggest a mind well formed to intellectual discipline which, at that period, could have been acquired only in a monastery. On the other hand, Filofey could not have entered the monastery before he came to manhood since, according to the rule drawn up by the Blessed Yevfrosin of Pskov, it was expressly forbidden to take young children or 'beardless youths' into the monastery whether for the purpose of book-learning or for the novitiate.<sup>25</sup>

It also appears from Filofey's correspondence with Misyur' Munezhin that he was not a member of the privileged classes and, contrary to the more generally accepted opinion,<sup>26</sup> may have been an obscure fully confirmed by A. A. Shakhmatov in his study 'Puteshestviye M. G. Misyur' Munezhina na vostok i Khronograf 1512 goda' (*Izvestiya otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti*, VI, St Petersburg, 1899, pp. 200–22). Their opinion is supported by A. I. Sobolevsky (in his review of Malinin's book in *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya*, St Petersburg, 1901 (November), p. 486) and by I. Yu. Krachkovsky, *Ocherki po istorii russkoy arabistiki*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1950, pp. 18–19 (the author's attention was drawn to the comments of Krachkovsky by a letter of 11 May 1958 from Professor P. N. Savitsky to whom his most sincere thanks are due). Of course, Misyur' Munezhin was profoundly Orthodox in his outlook, and his origin distinguished him from his purely Russian contemporaries only in so far as it may have been a contributory reason for the remarkable impartiality which he showed during his term of office in Pskovia.

It seems pertinent to note here that Malinin's dating—1524—of Filofey's epistle to Misyur' Munezhin (Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix VII), in which there is also one version of the theory of the Third Rome, cannot be accepted, since the letter was actually written in 1528, as will be made clear later from an analysis of certain of the dates mentioned in it.

<sup>23</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix V, p. 33. In another epistle to the same person, he repeats the same ideas, *ibid.*, appendix VII, pp. 37–8.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60; cf. N. K. Gudzy, *Khrestomatiya po drevney russkoy literature*, Moscow, 1952 (5th ed.), p. 193.

<sup>25</sup> Filofey's words in the epistle to the disgraced nobleman: 'from the strong [we must expect] oppression, from enemies and friends denunciations and calumnies, and from the humble and low-born humiliations and dishonour' are interpreted by Maslennikova to indicate that 'Filofey would hardly have written of humiliations and dishonour from the humble people of low birth had he himself belonged to them' (Maslennikova, *Bor'ba*, p. 199). Had Maslennikova taken Filofey's first statement—'from the strong—oppression'—her interpretation could equally well have been used to suggest that Filofey was not a member of the upper classes. In fact, this passage has no social significance but represents the Christian view of the vanity and frailty of all things worldly and human.

countryman, a peasant or a smallholder, since in one of the variants of the same letter he stressed that he was 'a most simple countryman [*preprost selyanin*], ignorant in word and mind'.<sup>27</sup> The fact that he was not of distinguished origin would not preclude the possibility that he could become abbot of his monastery,<sup>28</sup> but it would certainly imply that he would scarcely have been elevated to so exalted a position until he had proved his worth over many years of monastic life.

Whether Filofey took his vows under the Blessed Yevfrosin himself is unknown. Since Yevfrosin died in 1481 and Filofey was approximately fifty to sixty years old<sup>29</sup> in the first and second decades of the 16th century, this possibility cannot be excluded. If Filofey really began his monastic life under the founder of the monastery, the direct spiritual relationship between Yevfrosin and himself would have been a point in favour of his candidature as abbot. However, the absence of Filofey's name in the first version of the 'Life', which mentions the witnesses of the Blessed Yevfrosin's activities, shows that Filofey could not have figured as a source of information about the head and patron of the monastery. It must be borne in mind that in the Eleazarov monastery the abbot occupied a position of exceptional authority, since the council of elders, a common institution in

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Malinin, appendix VII, p. 37. The word *selyanin* has the various connotations of 'villager' (*sel'skiy zhitel'*), 'agricultural worker' (*zemledelets*), 'ignorant man' (*nevezha*), and 'country bumpkin' (*derevenshchina*) (cf. I. I. Sreznevsky, *Materialy dlya slovarya drevne-russkogo yazyka po pis'mennym pamyatnikam*, III, Part I, St Petersburg, 1903, p. 331). Judging from the insistence with which Filofey stresses his country origin, which would be in contrast with the urban provenance of a large part of the privileged classes of Pskovia, even of those partially occupied in agriculture (cf. B. D. Grekov, *Krest'iane na Rusi s drevneyshikh vremyon do XVII veka*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1946, p. 453, for an explanation of this custom of agricultural work among the *posadskkiye lyudi* or tradespeople of Pskov), it may be assumed that he was of those true countrymen of the old-fashioned, traditional type whose existence still centred round the village commune (cf. Grekov, *op. cit.*, p. 481, for a description of the two categories of agricultural workers in Pskov: the mobile, semi-urbanised, modern element and the *lyudi starinnyye, nepokhozhkiye, starozhil'tsy*). These were peasants and smallholders who, unlike those who had left the commune, remained untouched by the possibility of obtaining work within easy reach of the towns. It might, of course, be argued that Filofey used the term *selyanin* in one of the last two senses indicated by Sreznevsky. Although this would be in keeping with the tone of deliberate self-abasement prevalent in the ecclesiastical literature of this period (see note 31), the word is not used by other authors known to be of distinguished origin, and it therefore seems almost certain that Filofey used it to describe his social position rather than to denigrate his intellectual capacity: indeed any other connotation of *preprost selyanin, nevezha slovom i razumom* would make it appear that Filofey was attempting a pun—a trait not at all in keeping with his usual literary style.

<sup>28</sup> According to the rules drawn up by the Blessed Yevfrosin for the Eleazarov monastery, 'only the worthy' could be accepted as monks and not those who merely offered a contribution to the monastic funds (Malinin, *op. cit.*, p. 31). Since the monastery was only founded in the 15th century, this special proviso confirms that the practice of other monasteries in this respect was sometimes far from this impartial other-worldliness. Yevfrosin had recently been beatified and therefore his authority would doubtless be strictly respected. The Eleazarov monastery had a reputation for great austerity which would ill accord with the preference of the rich to the poor. What Nikitsky called the 'democratic character' of the church in Pskov (cf. A. Nikitsky, *Ocherk vnutrenney istorii Pskova*, St Petersburg, 1873, p. 210) should also be borne in mind. Cf. Serebryansky, *Ocherki*, pp. 471 *et seq.*

<sup>29</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, p. 39.



Russian monasteries, was unknown here.<sup>30</sup> The fact that Filofey is not entitled abbot in any of the various manuscripts indicates that his works were written before he attained the rank.<sup>31</sup> Yet Malinin supposes that Filofey became abbot during the reign of Vasily III or in the early years of Ivan IV's minority, which, if his chronology is correct, would imply that Filofey might have been abbot of his monastery when he wrote his epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich.

It seems probable that Filofey died in 1542, when the monastery already had a new abbot, Nil.<sup>32</sup> This supposition is indirectly borne out, if Shakhmatov's theory that Filofey was also engaged in editing the chronicle is accepted, since the chronicle in question breaks off in this year.<sup>33</sup> Another point to be borne in mind when considering the validity of Malinin's chronology is the probable age of Filofey at the beginning of Ivan IV's reign. A detail from one of Filofey's epistles would appear to have an indirect bearing on this problem. Filofey writes: 'For *I remember* when the same thing happened *in our time*, exactly thirty years ago.'<sup>34</sup> These words refer to an earthquake in Europe and are addressed to the grand ducal *d'yak* Misyur' Munekhin, probably between 1521 and 1522.<sup>35</sup> This would seem to lend colour to the supposition that at this period Filofey was between fifty and sixty years of age, since he is evidently writing of some event which both correspondents remembered. Misyur' Munekhin, who had already served as treasurer to the grand duke, would scarcely have been appointed to this responsible position in Pskov as a young man. His death in 1528 would also seem to point to his advanced years. The supposition that Filofey and Misyur'

<sup>30</sup> Smolitsch, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

<sup>31</sup> Mediaeval Russian authors were always very retiring in referring to themselves. The proud and power-loving Joseph of Volotsk, for example, when abbot of the rich monastery of Volokolamsk and leader of the 'possessors' party, designedly humbled himself by referring to himself as 'a sinful monk', 'thy pauper'. Epifany the Wise called himself 'very sinful and foolish', 'the worst of men', 'the last among Christians', 'unworthy to be a monk', and 'ignorant in word' (cf. Gudzy, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-8). A similar formula 'an indigent monk' is to be found in Filofey's writings. At the same time, it is difficult to imagine that the copyists of the epistles would neglect the opportunity of adding weight to Filofey's words and fail to refer to him as an abbot, if he had already attained that rank. It is interesting that so careful and competent an author as Milyukov (cf. *op. cit.*, II, pt. I, pp. 25-6) refers to Filofey as 'abbot'.

<sup>32</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix IV, p. 33.

<sup>33</sup> A. A. Shakhmatov, 'K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii Khronografa' (*Sbornik otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti*, LXVI, St Petersburg, 1899); Maslennikova, *Bor'ba*, p. 202, n. 2; A. N. Nasonov, 'Iz istorii pskovskogo letopisaniya' (*Istoricheskiye Zapiski*, AN SSSR, XVIII, 1946, p. 260).

<sup>34</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix IV, p. 30.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 166-7 (text). There were, in fact, earthquakes in Italy and in Crete in 1490, in the Greek archipelago—particularly on the island of Cos where 5,000 lives were lost—in 1491, and in Basle in 1492. Cf. R. Mallet 'Catalogue of recorded earthquakes' (*Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, London, 1853, p. 51) and J. Milne 'Catalogue of Destructive Earthquakes' (*loc. cit.*, 1911, p. 673). It is not very clear from the text which Filofey had in mind. Since he mentions tremors in the 'German lands' and in the sea it is possible, in view of the time news took to travel, that he considered all the tremors part of the same earthquake.

Munekhin were contemporaries is borne out by another detail in the same letter.<sup>36</sup> Here, after the stereotyped ending 'May you remain in good health, Lord, for many years in Christ, amen', there follows, unexpectedly, a sentence as from one equal to another: 'And write and tell me about your health.' Such an informal and friendly sentence certainly implies that the correspondents were of the same age, particularly when it is recalled how important a personage Misyur' Munekhin was in Pskov: he is addressed at the beginning of the same letter not only as 'Lord' (*gospodin*) but also as 'Sovereign' (*Gosudar*).

By this reckoning, Filofey must have been between seventy and eighty years old when Ivan IV began to rule. It seems unlikely that at this advanced age, particularly in an epoch when the average expectation of life was some fifty or sixty years, he would have been so active in literary work as to develop his theory of Moscow the Third Rome even further and give it its fullest expression, as Malinin maintained and Maslennikova now repeats.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the focal point of Filofey's interest gradually swung towards the defence of the oppressed and away from the sphere of church ideology, to which his thoughts on the significance of Moscow as the centre of the Orthodox faith belong.<sup>38</sup>

From this reconstruction of Filofey's biography on the basis of available data the following conclusions may be drawn. Filofey was of humble, probably peasant, origins. His scholarly achievements indicate that he must have become a monk as a young man. There seems little reason to suppose that the absence of any mention of him

<sup>36</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix V, p. 35.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 381–2; Maslennikova, *Bor'ba*, p. 190.

<sup>38</sup> An unknown contemporary writer recounts: 'Certain Christ-loving Pskovians begged this blessed elder [Filofey] to intercede for them by letter to the sovereign since this elder, who had never left the monastery, was known to the grand duke and to the nobles [*velmozhii*] both for the sanctity of his life and for his wisdom in words. Although he declined to plead for their wrongs in a letter to the sovereign, humbling himself as though he did not dare [to do so], yet later he showed much boldness in interceding for people both with the sovereign and with the boyars and the grand-ducal governors [*namestniki*] of Pskov and in accusing them of many injustices and much violence, not fearing death. The grand duke and the nobles, knowing his boldness and his carelessness of this life, dared not do him any harm' (Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix III, p. 25). This general characterisation of Filofey, evidently written by some admirer, adds certain verisimilar features to his personality in so far as this emerges from the epistles. It was probably written towards the end of Filofey's life, for it appears to sum up his activities, and in it he is referred to as the 'blessed Elder'. For this reason, the text can hardly be connected exclusively with the events of 1510, one of the occasions on which Filofey is known to have interceded for the people of Pskov in his letter to Vasily III, as Malinin, for instance, supposed (cf. Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 209–10). The description of the elder as a person who 'was known to the grand duke and to the nobles both for the sanctity of his life and for his wisdom in words', when taken in conjunction with the rest of the text which states clearly that Filofey began to intercede on behalf of the victims of the authorities only when his reputation for sanctity and wisdom was established, shows that at the beginning of his career as a writer Filofey wrote on more general questions—among them on his famous theory. The text thus indirectly confirms this interpretation of the sequence of events.

in the first version of the 'Life' of the Blessed Yevfrosin excludes the possibility that he had already attained sufficient status in the monastery to be permitted to address his epistle to Ivan III. The reference to an abbot Filofey in the second version of the 'Life' very probably applies to him and, if so, it is likely that he became abbot towards the end of Vasily III's reign or the beginning of Ivan IV's reign when he was already considerably advanced in years. His age, the evolution of his interests in his later years, and the possibility that he was already abbot at Vasily III's death make it improbable that his epistle was addressed to Ivan IV. There is evidence to indicate that he probably died in 1542.

### III

What does Filofey write about in his epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich?<sup>39</sup>

The first point<sup>40</sup> which commands attention is that most of the epistle is devoted to a consideration of purely factual aspects of the ecclesiastical life of the time—negative aspects from the point of view of the author, who is here defending the interests of the Russian church as a whole. It should be emphasised that the whole epistle is an attempt to obtain an improvement in the life of the Russian ecclesiastical community: it is, first and foremost, a criticism of certain aspects of contemporary practice in relation to the church.

At the beginning, Filofey notes that there are people who 'not only do not wish to live righteously themselves' but will not even leave unmolested 'those who live according to God'. From the rest of the letter it is clear what Filofey had in mind: the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, 'villages and vineyards' (*sela i vinogrady*), interference by the secular authority in the competence of the ecclesiastical courts, and cases where members of the clergy had been insulted or injured by the secular authority. Quoting article 58 of the 5th Oecumenical council, Filofey declares that perpetrators of such deeds should be 'burnt with fire', that 'their homes should be given to the church', and that in any case they 'should be excommunicated'.<sup>41</sup> In other words, the first point made in the epistle is directed at the confiscation of church lands.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, Filofey, making an almost direct reference to the grand duke himself, adds:

<sup>39</sup> There seems no foundation for Strémoukhoff's doubts (cf. *op. cit.*, p. 98, n. 82) as to whether the epistle is an actual letter to a grand duke. It certainly lacks the opening address but, to judge from its content, it is undoubtedly addressed to some person who possesses both the power and the authority to check the abuses against which the author protests.

<sup>40</sup> For the text of the epistle see Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix X, pp. 57–66.

<sup>41</sup> Although Filofey, and his contemporaries, refer to the edict of the 5th Oecumenical council, the council did not, in fact, issue any edict. *Ibid.*, pp. 648 *et seq.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, pp. 58–9.

'If those even who wear the crown should act in this way (trusting in riches and in noble birth)', such people will also be guilty of the same sin and, according to holy law, they will 'be excommunicated'.

Filofey next calls attention to the 'laws' established at a local Russian council in Vladimir under the direction of Metropolitan Kiril in 1274 and, basing his argument on these laws, he delivers himself of a sharp protest against simony.<sup>43</sup> 'Can it be worthy to receive God's grace for silver?' According to the laws of the church, those guilty of such offences should be excommunicated. Moreover, Filofey insists that it is essential to keep God's commandments and to lead a righteous life in every respect, for otherwise judgment will follow on transgression 'as in the imperial city' (an obvious analogy with the fate of Constantinople), and as in Russia in the past.

This is the point at which Filofey introduces his explanation of the historical role of the Russian church and the Russian realm, that is—his theory of Moscow the Third Rome.<sup>44</sup> He bases his theory on a quotation from the Apocalypse: 'The Woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars.' He explains that the Woman is the Church. Her flight into the wilderness is the flight from ancient Rome, which accepted the use of unleavened bread in the sacrament and, for this reason, fell 'incurably sick' of the 'heresy of Apolinaris'. A New Rome arose in 'the City of Constantine', but here also the Woman 'finds no peace', because of the 'unification' of the Greeks 'with the Latins at the eighth Church council', from which time the 'Church of Constantinople fell into ruin'. Then 'the Woman fled again', this time to the Third Rome 'which is the new, great Russia'. Russia, according to Filofey, 'is the wilderness' in which a place had been prepared for the Woman by God, because it had remained without the Christian faith for so long and because the Holy Apostles had never taught there. Last among the nations, Russia was illumined by the Grace of God: knowledge of the true God. 'And now the Holy Oecumenical Apostolic Eastern Church shines more strongly than the sun over the whole world. And there is only one Russian Orthodox Tsar in all the Universe.' He cares for the Church and upholds the Orthodox faith. But the 'Serpent-devil' casts water out of his mouth like a flood and seeks to drown the Woman in the water, perceiving how all the empires of the earth are drowning for lack of faith. As for the new Russian empire, though it stands in the Orthodox faith, there is a decrease of good works in her and an increase of injustice.<sup>45</sup>

Filofey goes on to say that in Russia 'the sign of the cross' is made without sufficient reverence,<sup>46</sup> and that the moral life of the Russians

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, pp. 59–61.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, p. 64.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, pp. 61–4.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, pp. 64–5.

is unworthy, since they often fall into 'sodomy'.<sup>47</sup> He concludes his epistle with an exhortation to 'try to be pure and sinless' in expectation of 'the day of the Lord', which will come unexpectedly.<sup>48</sup> Thus, contrary to the opinion of Malinin and of the historians who subscribe to his interpretation, these lines appear not as an 'apotheosis' of Russia but as a statement of fact, as a survey of the position from the point of view of the church and, at the same time, as an admonition from the church.

Malinin argued in an early article that<sup>49</sup> this epistle was addressed to Ivan IV. In view of the opposition which he encountered on this point, he tried hard to strengthen his position and returned many times to the same theme in his subsequent and more detailed work. He conceded that it was not implausible to suppose that the epistle was addressed to Ivan III; but he finally rejected the supposition on the following grounds:

Firstly, Filofey was not mentioned by the author of the first 'Life' of the Blessed Yevfrosin;<sup>50</sup> secondly, that an ordinary monk, such as Filofey must have been at this time, was unlikely to have entered into a personal correspondence with the Grand Duke Ivan III independently of Pamfil, the then abbot of the Eleazarov monastery, who was himself an author;<sup>51</sup> thirdly, 'The greatest obstacle to assigning Filofey's epistle to the reign of Ivan III is its complete failure to mention the judaistic heresy.' In other words, the elder would not have been writing about the way people made the sign of the cross at a time when far more serious things were going on within the Russian church. According to Malinin, Filofey's failure to mention the judaistic heresy would seem to indicate that he could have written to Ivan III only before 1487 when the struggle against the heresy first began; and then he was too young to do so;<sup>52</sup> fourthly, Malinin argues that the reason why the confiscation of ecclesiastical property is touched on is the measures brought into force against such property at the beginning of Ivan IV's reign in 1535;<sup>53</sup> and finally, it appeared indisputable to Malinin that in Filofey's epistles there was a gradual development of the idea of the Third Rome, culminating in the image of the Woman of the Apocalypse which occurs in the epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich. Basing his deductions on the development of the literary images, Malinin concludes that this epistle was written last of all and must therefore have been addressed to Ivan IV, though he was only a child at the time.<sup>54</sup> He even finds

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, pp. 65–6.

<sup>49</sup> *Malinin II*, pp. 72–126.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 121–33, 377. For the text of Abbot Pamfil's epistle see *P.L.*, I, pp. 90–1; and Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix I, pp. 1–6.

<sup>52</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 377–81.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 644 *et seq.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, appendix X, p. 66.

<sup>50</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 376–7.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 381–2.

certain features in the letter which suggest to him that the style had been adapted to the understanding of the boy-tsar.<sup>55</sup>

All these arguments of Malinin can be refuted. In order to grasp the real reasons which led Filofey to write the epistle in question, it is necessary to recall the events which took place at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries, i.e. in the reign of Ivan III. If this is done, many of the obscure points in Malinin's analysis become clear, and it is possible to refute him point by point.

#### IV

It is essential to bear in mind that Filofey was a citizen of Pskov and was consequently able to observe Moscow and the grand duke from the periphery of events. An ardent servant of the Orthodox faith, he could not remain indifferent to what was happening in Moscow, the seat of the metropolitan of all Russia. At the same time, as an inhabitant of the western borders of Russia, sufficiently far removed from the capital, he was able to distinguish clearly, more clearly indeed than the Muscovites themselves, the rise and growth of Moscow under Ivan III. In history the maxim that the onlooker sees most of the game is frequently borne out.<sup>56</sup>

A brief review of the most important facts of his reign shows that it was under Ivan III that almost all the existing great Russian territories became part of the grand duchy of Muscovy.<sup>57</sup> Towards the end of the century it was evident that Ryazan' and Pskov, the last strongholds of independence, would not resist Moscow's acquisitive influence for long: in fact, Pskov, the 'younger brother' of Novgorod the Great, had long since been drawn into the orbit of Moscow's

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 661-4.

<sup>56</sup> A case in some ways analogous to Filofey's was that of Kiprian († 1406), the Bulgarian metropolitan of Moscow, who edited the Life of Metropolitan Pyotr († 1326) and gave his own interpretation to it from the same 'onlooker's' point of view: the first Russian biographer of Metropolitan Pyotr, the bishop of Rostov, Prokhor († 1328), described Moscow as a city 'honourable for its humility', whereas Kiprian characteristically altered this description to a 'glorious city called Moscow' (P. Milyukov, *op. cit.*, III, p. 53). But the analogy is not complete. Whereas Kiprian's alteration must have been intended, to some extent, as a kind of diplomatic compliment to the Muscovites (more especially in view of the circumstances of his sojourn in Moscow), Filofey was a stranger to flattery.

<sup>57</sup> In 1463 all the Yaroslav princes (the grand prince and the regional princes) petitioned Ivan III to accept them into the service of Moscow and renounced their independence. In the 1470s the political strength of the north-west Russian republic was broken, and Novgorod the Great, with its vast possessions in north Russia, was incorporated into the united Russian state. In 1472 Perm was subjected to the ruler of Moscow. In 1474 the princes of Rostov sold to Moscow such of the lands of Rostov as remained in their possession. In 1485 Ivan besieged Tver', one of Moscow's most dangerous rivals for almost two hundred years, and the city was surrendered almost without a struggle. In 1489 Vyatka was finally subdued. In the 1490s the princes Vyazemsky and many minor princes of the Chernigov line, Odoyevskys, Novosil'skys, Vorotynskys, Mezetskys and also the princes of Chernigov and of Seversk (with their dependencies), acknowledged the sovereignty of the Muscovite state. (Cf. V. O. Klyuchevsky, *Sochineniya*, II, Moscow, 1957, p. 112; Oswald P. Backus, *Motives of West Russian Nobles in Deserting Lithuania for Moscow, 1377-1514*, Lawrence, 1957, pp. 94-110.)



foreign policy<sup>58</sup> and was governed by a representative of the grand duke, though it still retained its *veche* and its independent internal administration.<sup>59</sup> Faced with continual attacks from its Catholic neighbours, the Livonian Order and Lithuania, Pskov had naturally a particularly strong attachment to the Orthodox faith, which it was so often called on to defend in battle, and it had long had the habit of looking to the grand duke of Moscow for help and support in its frequent moments of peril.<sup>60</sup>

In 1480, after the 'stand on the Ugra', which had a definitely symbolic character as far as the balance of power between the Tartars and the Russians was concerned, Russia was finally free from her subjection to the Golden Horde. Ivan III's policy towards the east immediately took on a more active character. In the 1490s, the Moscow government also inaugurated a more active policy on its western borders. In 1492 the title of 'Grand Duke of Moscow' was altered by the addition of three words *I vseya Rusi* (and of all Russia).<sup>61</sup> This was in essence the declaration of a political programme, for the words implied the claim of the Muscovite state to

<sup>58</sup> Maslennikova, *Prisoyedineniye*, pp. 58 *et seq.*; K. V. Basilevich, *Vneshnyaya politika russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva, Vtoraya polovina XV veka*, Moscow, 1952, pp. 36 *et seq.*

<sup>59</sup> A. Nikitsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 281–2.

<sup>60</sup> Maslennikova, *Prisoyedineniye*, pp. 58–62, 67–8.

<sup>61</sup> Basilevich, *op. cit.*, pp. 338 *et seq.*; *Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva*, St Petersburg, XXXV, 18, p. 81. The epistle of Filofey dealt with in this study is addressed to the 'Grand Duke and Tsar Ivan Vasil'yevich'. Although Ivan III was not officially entitled to this form of address, the history of the use of the title 'tsar' in Russia up to this time in no way precludes the possibility that Filofey would have used it in addressing him. There are even isolated cases of the use of this title in addressing Russian princes in the 12th century. In the 14th century Dmitry Donskoy is called 'tsar'. From at least the 13th century onwards, Russians used the title of 'tsar' not only for the emperor at Constantinople, but also for many of the rulers with no established titles such as 'king' or 'prince', e.g. for the khans of the Golden Horde, the Crimea, Kazan', Astrakhan, Shemakh, and Siberia; for the Turkish sultans, for the Persian sheikhs, and for the rulers of Georgia. The title of 'tsar' was also given by the Russians to the 'vassal Tartar khans' (*sluzhilye tartarskiye khany*) resident in Russia. It is thus clear that in the Russia of the time the word 'tsar' in no way bore the connotation of an Orthodox Christian ruler. This remained so for some time. In 1591 in describing the Tartar invasion, Patriarch Iov called the khan 'the accursed tsar'. Cf. 'Povest' o chestnom zhitii tsarya i velikogo knyazya Fyodora Ivanovicha vseya Rusi' (*Polnoye sobraniye russkikh letopisey*, XIV, 1, St Petersburg, 1913, p. 13, abr. *P.S.R.L.*). The picture begins to change with the growth of the so-called second Southern Slavonic influence in Russia when the term 'tsar' began to assume a distinctly Orthodox connotation such as it already possessed in the Balkans. Probably the first to use the title of 'tsar' in this sense in Russia was Pakhomiy the Serb (Logafet). Ivan III himself approached this evolution of his title with care and circumspection, using 'tsar' in negotiations with certain specific states only, namely: Lubeck, Narva, Reval, and the grand master of the Livonian Order. It is true that he was sometimes addressed as 'tsar' by foreign envoys (but only orally and not in writing). Only in the treaty charter of 1493 with the Danish King John is Ivan called 'emperor' ('cum illustrissimo et potentissimo domino Johanne totius Rutzsie imperatore, magno Duce Valdimorie, Moscoviae . . .'). However, the title of 'tsar' was becoming more widely used in Russia itself. Filofey's immediate predecessor in its application to Ivan III was Zosima, the metropolitan of Moscow and of all the Russias, whose 'Izlozheniye Paskhalii', written in 1499, compared Ivan III to the 'tsar of Constantinople' and declared 'Moscow and all the Russian Land' to be 'the new city of Constantinople'. (Cf. V. Savva, *Moskovskiy tsari i vizantiyskiye vasilyevy*, Khar'kov, 1901, pp. 271–8; D. Strémoukhoff, *op. cit.*, p. 88; I. N. Zhdanov, *Russkiy bylevoy epos*, St Petersburg, 1895, pp. 14–15, 107).

all the territories which once formed part of the 'Kievan realm' of Saint Vladimir, Yaroslav the Wise, and Vladimir Monomakh. The realisation of the programme took several centuries to effect, but it was no accident that it was first advanced under Ivan III. It is not surprising that Moscow was beginning to be considered a new political force and that even great states like the Holy Roman empire, which was seeking to establish contact with Ivan III, began to look at Russia and her ruler with quite different eyes.<sup>62</sup>

Moscow's territorial expansion was accompanied by an increase in economic prosperity, the extent of which is indicated by the very marked increase in building in stone. The use of stone as a building material was always a sign of economic improvement in mediaeval Russia and frequently of political stability and success as well, and during Ivan III's reign at least twenty-six churches, walled fortifications and other edifices are known to have been built of stone, and the list is by no means complete.<sup>63</sup>

With this increase in power and prosperity under Ivan III, Moscow began more and more clearly to emulate the 'grand style' of Byzantium in jurisdiction, administrative organisation, and court life;<sup>64</sup> and the position of its key-stone, the church, was also subject to the general tendency towards far-reaching changes. Here a problem arose which was of interest to the Russian church in general and to the diocese of Pskov in particular—more especially to the monks. This was the problem of church property, and it gave rise to many serious disagreements. It had already arisen in the 14th century, and it had repercussions on various aspects of ecclesiastical policy throughout the 15th century and was inherent in all the so-called heretical teachings.<sup>65</sup> However, it was not confined to differences within the church itself, for the secular power was quick to perceive the possible advantages of a church doubtful of its moral right to defend its earthly possessions, and the secular power's readiness to take over ecclesiastical lands lent the whole question an added urgency from without. This naturally created a tense situation, which was further aggravated by monastic opposition to the tendency of the secular power to interfere in ecclesiastical administration and jurisdiction.

<sup>62</sup> Basilevich, *op. cit.*, pp. 225 *et seq.*; Chayev, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. the most interesting work of P. N. Savitsky, a pioneer in this field, 'Podyom i depressiya v drevne-russkoy istorii', *Yevraziyskaya Khronika*, Paris, XI, 1935, pp. 65-100 and his 'Ritmy mongol'skogo veka', *Yevraziyskaya Khronika*, Paris, XII, 1937, pp. 104-55. Also *Istoriya russkogo iskusstva*, ed. by I. E. Grabar', V. S. Kemenov, V. N. Lazarev, III, Moscow, 1955, and G. H. Hamilton, *The Art and Architecture of Russia*, The Pelican History of Art, 1954.

<sup>64</sup> L. V. Cherepnin, *Russkiye feodal'nyye arkhivy XIV-XV vekov*, 2 vols, Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, I, pp. 253-85; V. Savva, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-9.

<sup>65</sup> E. Golubinsky, *op. cit.*, II, pt. 2; I. U. Budovnits, *op. cit.*, Chapter II, 'The Possessors and Non-Possessors', pp. 66-109; N. A. Kazakova and Y. S. Lur'ye, *Antifeodal'nyye yereticheskiye dvizheniya na Rusi XIV-nachala XVI veka*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1955.

As far as Pskov itself is concerned, there is evidence that Metropolitan Kiprian dispatched a missive to its inhabitants as early as 1395 saying that, as laymen, they should not usurp the right to judge or execute priests or interfere with ecclesiastical lands and villages.<sup>66</sup> Some time later, he found it necessary to lay down in a safe conduct for the archbishop of Novgorod that no layman should dare to interfere with the archbishop's jurisdiction over the clergy, that no member of the clergy should seek to evade the archbishop's authority on pain of excommunication, and that no layman should dare to interfere with the immovable property belonging to the archbishop.<sup>67</sup> In 1419 the question of the inviolability of ecclesiastical property was also raised in a treatise sent to Pskov by Archbishop Simeon;<sup>68</sup> and in 1463, Metropolitan Feodosiy exhorted the inhabitants of Novgorod not to infringe the archbishop's rights over the clergy and not to interfere with the immovable property of the church.<sup>69</sup> The same year, the authorities of Pskov sequestered the immovable property of the archbishop of Novgorod within their territory for two years, and used the revenues for civic purposes. The archbishop reacted by complaining to the metropolitan who wrote to the Pskovians exhorting them to obey the archbishop for fear of the holy laws of the church and not to molest the church of God.<sup>70</sup> In 1468 the clergy of Pskov raised in the *veche* (council of citizens) the question of the separation of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the secular;<sup>71</sup> and in 1471, several lots of land were confiscated from the cathedral of the Holy Trinity in Pskov on the authority of the *posadniki* (civil authorities) and the *veche*. This action provoked indignation among the compilers of the so-called first Pskovian chronicle, who referred to the rulings of the fathers of the church and threatened 'with anathema' . . . 'in this life and the next' all those, even those 'who wear the crown', who should offend churches and monasteries.<sup>72</sup> There can be no doubt either that Filofey knew this part of the chronicle or that he and the chronicler shared a common source, i.e. these same patristic rulings.<sup>73</sup>

In 1478, after the annihilation of Novgorod's political independence, Ivan III confiscated ecclesiastical lands in the Novgorod dependencies. This cannot have failed to attract the attention of Filofey. But it is uncertain whether he knew in detail of the truly

<sup>66</sup> *Akty istoricheskiye* (abr. *Akty*), I, p. 18; cf. *Russkaya Istoricheskaya Biblioteka* (abr. *R.I.B.*), St Petersburg, VI, cols. 232-3.

<sup>67</sup> *Akty*, I, p. 16.

<sup>68</sup> *R.I.B.*, VI, col. 402.

<sup>69</sup> *Akty*, I, no. 77.

<sup>70</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, St Petersburg, 1848, IV, cf. Golubinsky, *op. cit.*, II, pt. 2, pp. 526-7; *Akty*, I, no. 277.

<sup>71</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, p. 253; cf. Cherepnin, *op. cit.*, pp. 421-2.

<sup>72</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, pp. 237-9.

<sup>73</sup> Maslennikova, *Prisoyedineniye*, pp. 160-1: of course, as Maslennikova rightly notes, the contrary assumption that this passage is copied from Filofey is unlikely, since in his epistle it is given in a slightly abbreviated form.

dramatic negotiations—as to the extent of the confiscations—between Ivan III and *posadniki* and other representatives of Novgorod and the archbishop of Novgorod.<sup>74</sup> In the accounts of the decline of Novgorod's political independence given in the Pskov chronicles, no mention is made of the confiscation of church property in 1478.<sup>75</sup> The chronicler simply writes, at once naïvely and diplomatically: '... I would have written more, but I can write nothing by reason of the many complaints.'<sup>76</sup> It must be borne in mind that the Pskovians themselves took an active part in the grand duke's attack on their 'elder brother' Novgorod, supporting him with an armed force which besieged Novgorod for 'eight weeks' and also victualling his forces.<sup>77</sup> They had shown themselves so ardently pro-Muscovite in the matter that Ivan III thought it necessary to compel both the Novgorod boyars and other classes of the population to swear a special oath that the Novgorodians would not try to avenge themselves on the Pskovians for the help which Pskov had rendered Moscow.<sup>78</sup>

There can be little doubt that the significance (and in all probability the details) of the grand duke's seizure of the church's private property were perfectly clear to the leaders of the Pskov diocese which came under the administration of the archbishop of Novgorod. They may well have supposed that, if Pskov were completely incorporated in the Muscovite state, something similar might happen to the lands of the monasteries and churches of Pskov. But their fears were outweighed by more urgent considerations since it was equally clear to them that without Moscow's help it would be difficult, if not impossible, to defend Pskov against the constant threat from the Catholic West. A typical example of the manifestations of this ever-present danger is to be found in a picturesque entry in the chronicle for the year 1480: 'God watched over our town . . . the Germans came as far as the lake, burning and sacking the district of Pskov and the smoke and the flames could be seen from Pskov.'<sup>79</sup>

The ten-year truce made with the Livonian Order in 1482<sup>80</sup> ended in fact in 1495, and its breakdown resulted in another incident in Pskov touching on the rights of the priesthood. When raising levies in response to a call from the grand duke for a campaign against the Swedes and the Germans, the elected representatives of Pskov wished

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *P.S.R.L.*, XXV, M-L., 1944, p. 319. Analogous measures with regard to monastic lands were taken by the grand duke of Moscow about 1490 in the area of Beloozero. He also forbade landowners to give their inheritances to monasteries, a law which obtained in Tver', Mikulin, Torzhok, Obolensk etc. A. Pavlov, *Istoricheskiy ocherk sekulyarizatsii tserkovnykh zemel' v Rossii*, Odessa, 1871, pp. 36–7.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *P.L.*, I, pp. 74–5 and II, pp. 57–8, 211–17.

<sup>76</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, 1848, p. 259.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 258–60.

<sup>78</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, p. 263.

<sup>78</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, XXV, pp. 320–1.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 265–6.

to take money or men from among the clergy, who evaded this only by invoking certain patristic rulings on the immunity of ecclesiastical lands from such obligations. The *posadniki* wanted to force the priests to obey their will and to dishonour them by sentencing them to be flogged with a knout. Certain priests had their clothes torn off at a meeting of the *veche* (some sources report that they were stripped naked, others—that it was merely to their under-garments) and were otherwise insulted; but in the end nothing was taken from them, and they succeeded in convincing the laity of the existence of the patristic rulings which they had invoked.<sup>81</sup> This episode, of which Filofey could not possibly have remained unaware, is especially significant because such occurrences were—later—to give rise to his epistle to Ivan III, which touches in part on the generally undisciplined attitude of the Russians in relation to their church.

Under the year 1499 the Pskov chronicle laconically records a most important event: 'In January the Grand Duke confiscated ecclesiastical lands in Novgorod, from both monasteries and churches, and gave them to the lesser nobility as estates, with the blessing of Metropolitan Simon.'<sup>82</sup> This event was the immediate cause which impelled Filofey to undertake his famous epistle. As Pavlov has already shown,<sup>83</sup> the secularisation of church lands on this occasion was extremely serious and on a larger scale than in 1478. For the citizens of Pskov, this new interference by the secular authorities in church affairs coincided with a characteristic crisis in the political field. Hardly had the chronicle noted under 1498 'The Grand Duke Ivan was angry with his son Vasily. That very winter the Grand Duke Ivan named his grandson prince Dmitry as [heir to] the Grand Duchy',<sup>84</sup> than the following entry appears under the year 1499 together with the news of the confiscation of church property in Novgorod: 'The Grand Duke has appointed his son Vasily prince of Novgorod and Pskov.'<sup>85</sup> The citizens of Pskov were disturbed by this evidence of the arbitrary way in which the grand duke evidently considered himself entitled to appoint a prince to take over the government of their hitherto free republic, and they sent a delegation to present a petition to Ivan III and his grandson, asking that Pskov might retain its traditional relationship with Moscow: 'and that whosoever should be Grand Duke of Moscow might also be our sovereign'. Ivan III grew angry: 'Am I, the Grand Duke, not free in my children and in my duchy? I shall give the sovereignty to whom I wish.' He also arrested some of the delegates. It was only after a

<sup>81</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, p. 269.

<sup>83</sup> Pavlov, *op. cit.*, pp. 34–6.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 271. Cf. V. I. Gerasimova, 'Prisoyedineniye Pskova k Moskovskomu tsentralizovannomu gosudarstvu' (*Uchonyye Zapiski Gosudarstvennogo Pedagogicheskogo Instituta imeni A. I. Gertsena*, 78, Leningrad, 1948, pp. 123–4).

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 271.

<sup>84</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, p. 270.

second and equally unsuccessful delegation that the grand duke sent the boyar Ivan Chebotov to Pskov as his ambassador. Chebotov, in accordance with all the traditional formalities, informed the *veche*: 'The Grand Duke will retain his patrimony (*otchina*) as of old.' In 1500, again at the request of a special delegation, those who had been detained were freed and returned 'in good health'.<sup>86</sup>

This episode, which finally turned out favourably for Pskov, showed once again the degree to which Pskov was dependent on the good- or ill-will of the grand duke and the fact that its political independence hung by a precarious thread on the benevolence of the rulers of Moscow. The chronicle, moreover, is full of the renewed hostility of the Livonian Order<sup>87</sup> which always awoke the most 'Moscowphile' tendencies of the people of Pskov. This combination of circumstances made it clear that Pskov could not retain its existing status but must in the near future either submit voluntarily to complete integration with Moscow or be crushed between Moscow's growing power and the belligerence of its Western neighbours.

These were the conditions under which Filofey wrote his epistle to Ivan III.

## V

The monks of Pskov were naturally in no position to make a formal protest against Ivan III's confiscation of church property in Novgorod in 1499, which was undertaken with the blessing of the metropolitan of Moscow and had no direct bearing on Pskov itself. Clearly, this was why Pamfil, the abbot of the Eleazarov monastery who was well known as an author, did not take it upon himself to try to call the grand duke of Moscow to order or deliver him a lecture on the rules of behaviour. The initiative for such a step seems unlikely to have come from the circle of Archbishop Genadiy Gonofov of Novgorod, who was himself none too popular in Pskov. He pursued a strong pro-Muscovite line in his ecclesiastical policy and was at this time absorbed in other matters (in the preparation of a decisive campaign against the heretics).<sup>88</sup> It was only reasonable therefore for the church to enlist a hitherto unknown force: the erudition, business-like logic, and conviction of the elder Filofey. In so far as he was an inmate of the Eleazarov monastery which kept very stringent discipline and allowed its abbot completely autocratic power, Filofey naturally undertook the role of 'mentor' to the grand duke and to Moscow either with his abbot's blessing or, at the very least, with his full knowledge. Yet, at the same time, he advanced his views at his own risk. True, he keeps very strictly throughout to the general

<sup>86</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, IV, pp. 271-2.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 269-74.

<sup>88</sup> *Russkii Biograficheskii Slovar'*, article on Genadiy, p. 397; Nikitsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-290.



epistolary tone of a discourse on principles and not on concrete facts. But a study of his epistle shows that the theses which he was defending were not of an abstract nature. On the contrary, of primary importance—in view of the imminent impending change in the *status quo* of Pskovia—was the immediate threat to the position of the church in Pskov which first induced Filofey to take up his pen. The great urgency of this problem called for a reassertion of the inviolability of ecclesiastical property and of the rights of the priesthood, for the Pskovians themselves had seen these rights infringed on various occasions. The discussion of this question at the council of 1503–4 shows that it was of current interest to the Russian church as a whole. The same applies to Filofey's second point—the prevalence of simony. It is interesting that simony proved to be the stumbling block in the career of Archbishop Genadiy Gonozyov who enthusiastically engaged in the sale of high ecclesiastical positions, even after the council, of which he was a member, had condemned such practices.<sup>89</sup> It seems probable that he was similarly engaged before the council met, and that his Novgorod-Pskov activities in this field furnished Filofey with material for his epistle.

The next practical point in Filofey's letter concerns errors in making the 'sign of the cross': it is not entirely clear what exactly he had in mind here;<sup>90</sup> but it is evident that his contemporaries would be familiar with the problem, just as they were with the other points of his epistle. It must be remembered in this connection that Filofey was a monk of the Eleazarov monastery whose founder had earned fame by defending a detail—'the true alleluia'. In the same manner, the correct way of making the sign of the cross—a matter of cardinal importance in the eyes of the church—was later to cause great excitement at the *Stoglav* in 1551. Like many other issues debated in the *Stoglav*, the question of the sign of the cross undoubtedly had a long history behind it. Filofey was evidently one of the first authors to deal with this problem; but the way in which he sets out his arguments makes it clear that he is writing of a well-known phenomenon. Finally, his reference to sodomy appears particularly apt if it is remembered that Metropolitan Zosima, who was relieved of his office in 1594, was later accused of this sin by Iosif Volotsky.<sup>91</sup> Sodomy was widespread, which is one of the reasons why the church encouraged the wearing of beards.<sup>92</sup> Filofey approaches the subject with reserve, for it was a delicate one which might have been interpreted by certain highly-placed people as a direct personal attack.

<sup>89</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, VI, 1855, p. 49.

<sup>90</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 652–6; cf. Golubinsky, *Istoriya* . . . , II, 2, p. 482.

<sup>91</sup> Kazakova and Lur'ye, *op. cit.*, appendix 25, p. 428.

<sup>92</sup> V. Zhmakin, *Metropolit Daniil, yego sochineniya*, Moscow, 1881, pp. 20 *et seq.*; Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 657 *et seq.*

Filofey raises four issues in his epistle, all of which were important from the church's point of view. He seems to be trying to spur the lay authority into taking action on them along the lines which the church desired. But how was he to persuade the very authority which had itself already confiscated church property to act in the interests of the church?

With a touch of true genius, Filofey took the course of impressing on this authority that it must be the stronghold of Orthodoxy, its true centre, which is the centre of the world ('all the orthodox kingdoms have been united') and will never cease to exist ('there will be no fourth Rome'). Moreover, in formulating this idea, Filofey was really giving expression to a concept of which the secular power and the Muscovite church were already hazily conscious. They were aware that after 1453 Byzantium was politically finished, and they sought an explanation of its political death in what they regarded as its betrayal of Orthodoxy in the Florentine Union. The moral was clear: fidelity to Orthodoxy was essential for political well-being and if the state was to prosper. Such concepts appear in the manifesto which Ivan III addressed to the archbishop of Novgorod in 1470 and also in Metropolitan Filip's exhortations to the inhabitants of Novgorod.<sup>93</sup> Ivan III's marriage to Sophia Palaeologus, though it probably had less direct influence on the cultural and political development of Moscow than is often supposed, undoubtedly increased Russia's awareness of her 'Byzantine heritage' and caught the imagination of the people of Pskov, who gave a warm welcome to the last Byzantine princess on her way to Moscow. In their eyes the marriage increased the dignity of Russia in general and of Moscow in particular.<sup>94</sup>

In elaborating the new ideology of Moscow as a Christian empire and the new Constantinople Filofey had an immediate precursor in Metropolitan Zosima, the head of the Russian church. In 1492 there appeared the 'Izlozheniye Paskhalii na Osmuyu Tsyachu let', 'at the command of the Sovereign, the Grand Duke Ioann Vasil'yevich of all the Russias, by the venerable Zosima, Metropolitan of all the Russias'. This introduced the following idea: God had raised up the tsar of Constantinople, showing him the sign of the holy cross in the heavens; now God had raised up 'his kinsman, also abiding in the Orthodox faith, the pious and Christ-loving Grand Duke Ivan Vasil'yevich, Sovereign and Autocrat of all the Russias, the new Tsar of Constantinople and of the new city of Constantinople, the Sovereign of Moscow and of all the Russian land and of many other lands'.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>93</sup> *Akty*, I, nos. 80, 280, 281; *R.I.B.*, VI, nos. 100, 102.

<sup>94</sup> Basilevich, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-88; *P.L.*, I, p. 74, II, pp. 189-92.

<sup>95</sup> *R.I.B.*, VI, col. 795-6; Strémooukhoff, *op. cit.*, p. 91; Kazakova and Lur'ye, *op. cit.*, pp. 190 *et seq.*; A. A. Zimin, *I. S. Peresvetov i yego sovremenniki*, Moscow, 1958, pp. 408-10.

Filofey himself emerges from his epistle as an extremely cautious ideologist, putting forward only ideas which had already found credence with Ivan III. Yet he surpassed Zosima as an ideologist, for he develops these ideas in such a way as to justify a distinct and complete concept, that of Moscow the Third Rome, explaining in detail how it came about that the Russian land, the last to be converted to Christianity, should have become, as was now manifest, the world centre of the true faith. Since the concept of a Third Rome was new, Filofey expounded it in detail, explaining all the symbolic images. He sets out the full theory once and for all and never returns to it in such detail in his later works.

The fact that the historical proofs of his theory are worked out so logically and cautiously tends to reinforce Shakhmatov's assumption that Filofey already had some experience as an annalist.<sup>96</sup> This would be an additional reason for Abbot Pamfil to agree that Filofey should write to the grand duke on the subject of the Third Rome, since he would be familiar with the weaknesses of the Second Rome through his work on the Russian chronicle. Proof of his scholarship and competence lies in the irreproachable accuracy of his chronology, which has been called in question only in one instance to be found in a letter to Misyur' Munekhin. Filofey writes: 'It is ninety years since the Greek empire has been ruined and fails to stand . . .'.<sup>97</sup> Malinin thought that this referred to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and that Filofey's memory was at fault when he said that 'ninety years' had elapsed since it took place.<sup>98</sup> Shakhmatov, on the other hand, while agreeing that it was the fall of Constantinople which Filofey had in mind, preferred to assume that the chronicle was inaccurate in giving 1528 as the date of Misyur' Munekhin's death: he suggested instead that he had died in 1543.<sup>99</sup> But surely Filofey had a different event in mind: the Ferrara-Florentine council of 1438. This is clear from his basic idea, which is that the 'ruin of the empire' was a punishment meted out to the Greeks 'because they betrayed the Greek Orthodox Faith to the Latin'<sup>100</sup> in accepting an agreement to unite the churches. It also follows from the indisputable fact that Misyur' Munekhin died in March 1528,<sup>101</sup> exactly ninety years after the opening of the Greco-Latin negotiations in Ferrara. Since the Russian year began in September, Filofey could have written his letter to Munekhin at any time during the last six months of Munekhin's life. As a result of the failure of historians to realise this, they have assumed that Filofey made a chronological error. His chronology, however, is perfectly accurate—an

<sup>96</sup> Shakhmatov, *op. cit.*, 'K voprosu . . .', p. 119.

<sup>97</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix VII, p. 41.

<sup>98</sup> Shakhmatov, *op. cit.*, 'K voprosu . . .', p. 119.

<sup>100</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix VII, pp. 41–2.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>101</sup> *P.L.*, I, p. 105.

important element in his make-up as an author, for it bears indirect witness to his erudition and to his understanding of the importance of dates, a feature which, in its turn, lends colour to Shakhmatov's theory that Filofey was the editor of the *Chronograph* of 1512.

Another point of interest in Filofey's epistle is that his theory of the Third Rome is merely one of a series of practical arguments in favour of greater attention by the secular authorities—i.e. the grand duke—to the defence of the interests of the church. Filofey does not appear to be trying to flatter the grand duke with his theory: he seems rather to want to confront him with the full implications of an existing situation by denouncing the various sinful abuses to which the church is exposed while simultaneously pointing out the importance of Muscovy and her ruler as refuge and guardian of the Orthodox faith. Filofey's theme is that as Moscow is the Third Rome, she must learn to be worthy of her historic destiny. His epistle is entirely free from all elements which might suggest an apotheosis of Moscow or of autocracy. The Third Rome exists as an established fact, but the devil who tempts the elect is powerful. The first duty must be the struggle to overcome weaknesses and temptations, for the task is appointed by God and is the direct result of the historical development of the Orthodox faith.

## VI

When could Filofey's epistle have been written? The most likely supposition is under the direct impact of the confiscations in the Novgorod district, most probably between 1500 and 1501, when the inhabitants of Pskov had particular reason to fear a repetition of Novgorod's fate should Ivan III wish to incorporate Pskov *in toto* into the Muscovite state. As Malinin pointed out, it could not have been written immediately after the council of 1503-4, because two of the questions whose importance Filofey stresses (simony and ecclesiastical property) were resolved at the council along the lines which he recommends.<sup>102</sup> Since Ivan III died on 26 October 1505, it is hardly likely that these questions would have been raised again during his lifetime, at least with such urgency. Thus, if the epistle was addressed to him, it must have been written between 1499, the

<sup>102</sup> As the question of church property was unexpectedly put to the council in 1503 by Ivan III after other matters had been dealt with and when several of the delegates had already left Moscow and had to be specially recalled, it seems reasonable to assume that (a) Filofey's epistle had not yet influenced the grand duke, since the decisions of the council contain no hint of the doctrine of Moscow the Third Rome and (b) Filofey himself was not present. His absence would be natural since at the time he did not occupy any outstanding position in the monastic hierarchy. For details of the council of 1503-4 see A. A. Zimin, 'Knyazheskiye dukhovnyye gramoty nachala XVI veka' (*Istoricheskiye Zapiski*, AN SSSR, 27, 1948, pp. 270-1) and 'Ob uchastii Iosifa Volotskogo v sobore 1503 g.' (*Poslaniya Iosifa Volotskogo*, AN SSSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1959, pp. 370-4).

year of the political crisis during which Pskov seemed in such imminent danger of losing her independence, and the convening of the council in 1503.

One of Malinin's chief objections to this dating is Filofey's failure to mention one of the most pressing problems of Ivan III's reign—the heresy of the Judaisers. But his 'complete silence'<sup>103</sup> on this subject proves nothing: when analysing historical sources it is advisable to apply the analysis to the existing material and not to that which the historian thinks ought to exist. However, even if Malinin's approach is considered valid, an explanation of Filofey's reticence can still be given. As has been seen, Filofey had undertaken a definite task—the defence of ecclesiastical property against confiscation—and he approached it at once cautiously and directly. He must have known that heretical influences had penetrated to representatives of the highest circles in Moscow,<sup>104</sup> and it would therefore have been inexpedient to introduce the delicate topic of heresy into his epistle, and perhaps by so doing, to compromise the success of an already sufficiently awkward task. Moreover, the problem of the Judaisers had been examined in 1490, and officially the heresy was supposed to have been crushed. As one who had to do with the compilation of the chronicles, Filofey was also very probably aware that Archbishop Genadiy of Novgorod was taking a number of measures against the heresy. It might have been assumed with complete justice that the fate of the heretics was already sealed, and Filofey therefore remained silent. He concentrated instead on other aspects of church life in the Third Rome which he also considered to be extremely important and equally due for reform.

Now that the most probable date of Filofey's epistle has been established in relation to the background of events in Russia at the beginning of the 16th century, it remains to examine Malinin's views on the order in which the epistles were written. These are based on his interpretation of the development of Filofey's ideas. A study of Filofey's relations with the Muscovite authorities and more particularly with their representative in Pskov, the grand-ducal *d'yak* Misyur' Munekhin, shows a gradual growth in the monk's importance. To some extent, this is reflected in the tone of his epistles. A comparative analysis of the three epistles in which he mentions the theory of the Third Rome also shows how the idea developed, probably under Munekhin's influence, from a strictly Orthodox 'morality tale', in which ecclesiastical politics play as great a part as actual historical events, to a broader historico-religious theory. Lastly, the

<sup>103</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, p. 377.

<sup>104</sup> G. V. Vernadsky, 'The Heresy of the Judaisers and the Policies of Ivan III of Moscow' (*Speculum*, VIII, Cambridge, Mass., 1933, pp. 439–41).

epistles to Vasily III and to Misyur' Munekhin contain certain points which tend to confirm the supposition that the epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich came first and was addressed to Ivan III.

At the beginning of the 16th century Filofey was an obscure, humble monk who had never left his monastery. The sequence of events which brought him to the notice of the authorities appears on the whole to be perfectly logical. Whether Ivan III read his epistle or not cannot be known for lack of information. It is most probable that he did read it, or at least that several of the more cultured members of his immediate entourage were familiar with its content. The Moscow government valued educated and informed citizens whose ability could be exploited in the interests of the state,<sup>105</sup> and Filofey's epistle made it aware of the existence of an authoritative and useful man of letters. His theory of Moscow's position as the unshakable centre of the Orthodox world, combined with his exhortations that she should try to live in a manner befitting her historic mission, undoubtedly helped to intensify the national consciousness of certain influential groups within the country, even if it could not serve as a focal point for Moscow's foreign policy. After the emergence of the Josephians and their victory at the council of 1503, it also became clear that the line which Filofey took in his epistle to the Grand Duke and Tsar Ivan Vasil'yevich was in keeping with the principles of the ecclesiastical policy pursued by the Muscovite government. In these circumstances it is not surprising that after the incorporation of Pskov into the Russian state in 1509 we have evidence of a friendly correspondence between the originator of the theory of Moscow the Third Rome and the grand duke's most trusted representative, the *d'yak* Misyur' Munekhin, the tone of which strongly suggests that the correspondents also knew each other personally. At this time Filofey must already have been well known for his literary activity both as a chronicler and as a theoretician.

Another indication that Filofey had gained considerably in authority by the time he addressed his second epistle to Vasily III is the striking difference in tone between the two letters. Filofey addresses Ivan III impersonally, writing only of the essential business in hand as though he did not dare to try to establish a more direct human relationship. On the other hand, he addresses Vasily III<sup>106</sup> directly: 'To thee, most illustrious and most high', 'Shining light of Orthodoxy', etc. This letter also shows Filofey as an advocate of ecclesiastical interests at a time of political crisis. As Malinin thought, it can rightly be ascribed to the period immediately after the annulment

<sup>105</sup> Cf. *P.S.R.L.*, VI, p. 192 for the rôle played, for example, by the *d'yak* Stepan Borodaty.

<sup>106</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix IX, pp. 49-56.



of the usual anti-republican measures undertaken by the *namestniki* of Vasily III who were 'purging' the territory of Pskov. Filofey pleads for the 'oppressed' and begs the grand duke to 'free [them] from the oppressors'. It is clear from this that his protest was not against the measures of the grand duke but against the abuses of his agents. The first Pskov chronicle provides a vivid account of the various outrages which these men committed after the grand duke had left Pskov. Severe taxation, enforced on pain of death, constrained many citizens to flee to other towns 'deserting their wives and children'.

And those who were foreigners living in Pskov returned each to his own land, for it was impossible to live in Pskov, only the citizens of Pskov themselves remained, since the earth would not swallow them and to fly upwards is impossible.

As though in answer to Filofey's appeal,

In the year 7019 (1511), the Grand Duke removed those *namestniki* and sent (others) . . . and these *namestniki* began to be clement towards the citizens of Pskov and the citizens began to reassemble in Pskov from whithersoever they had fled.<sup>107</sup>

The anonymous author<sup>108</sup> who said that Filofey interceded with the sovereign, the boyars and the *namestniki* for various people, 'accusing them of many injustices and much violence and not fearing death', undoubtedly had the same period in mind.

The epistle to Vasily III, like that to Ivan III, is primarily concerned with abuses against morality and against the church. As though following on from his first letter, Filofey writes: 'The Tsar should still fulfil two commandments', one of which concerns the correct sign of the cross, while the other enjoins respect for the findings of the 5th council forbidding the confiscation of ecclesiastical property and observance of the 'traditions and customs of the great Tsar Constantine' (in the spirit of 'thy forbears'). Significant here is the reminder that Vasily III is heir to Ivan III, 'the new Constantine'. It is also characteristic of Filofey as a defender of ecclesiastical interests that the two Russian rulers whom he mentions are 'Blessed Saint Vladimir' and 'great, god-appointed Yaroslav', besides 'other blessed saints, whose line reaches down to thee, Sovereign'. Both these rulers were known as protectors and patrons of the church. Moreover, Saint Vladimir in a sense was the founder of the church 'in the wilderness', while Yaroslav was not a Muscovite hero but was primarily remembered in connection with the establishment of the ancient liberties of the Northern territories.<sup>109</sup>

<sup>107</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, V, p. 288.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. fn. 38.

<sup>109</sup> George Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven, 1948, pp. 78-80.

Next follows a protest against sodomy, as in the letter to Ivan III, and Filofey's comments here are bolder and franker than the tone of the epistle as a whole. The impression created is that Filofey is insisting on the importance of a subject which he had touched on only in a more general sense in his letter to Ivan III. Malinin sees in the greater reticence of the letter to Ivan Vasil'yevich an indication that Filofey was addressing his strictures to a young boy.<sup>110</sup> But this line of reasoning is not borne out by the complexity of the rest of the letter. The explanation of the theory of Moscow the Third Rome, in particular, with its lengthy interpretation of an abstruse passage from the Apocalypse, is by no means adapted to the understanding of a youth, who could not have been more than twelve years old if it be accepted that Filofey died in 1542. The letter ends with a reference to the Third Rome which is destined to stand until the Second Coming.

The development of the theory of the Third Rome is best examined in relation to Filofey's acquaintance with Misyur' Munekhin who is thought by Shakhmatov to have provided Filofey with some information for the Chronograph of 1512, of which the elder was editor. Misyur' Munekhin may also have told him of his own impressions of his mission to the Middle East, more particularly Constantinople. Filofey, in his capacity as ideologist of the New Rome, was naturally interested in the past and present of the 'Second Rome'. In the 'Tale of the Taking of Tsar'grad',<sup>111</sup> included in the Chronograph of 1512, two distinct voices can be detected: one—the familiar ecclesiastical intonation—stresses that this terrible misfortune was a judgment on the sins of this 'New Rome', 'in which all that was most excellent, the divine and the human, was assembled'; the other—more realistic, like that of some eye-witness, also Christian, but more detached—says that in spite of the destruction of Tsar'grad's independence, there remained 'a seed, like a spark covered with ash, among the multitude of heathen powers'. This 'seed' is the continued presence of the 'sees' of the 'Patriarch', 'Metropolitans' and 'Bishops', of 'leaders of the Orthodox Faith' who 'live unharmed in all towns', and of the 'holy churches'. In this excerpt the chronicler appears not as a moralist but simply as the compiler of all available evidence on the fate and present state of the Second Rome. Shakhmatov's theory that this evidence was supplied by Munekhin to Filofey as editor of the Chronograph thus appears a most probable surmise.

The more impartial note first sounded in the Chronograph is also evident in the brief confirmation of the theory of the Third Rome at the beginning of Filofey's epistle to Vasily III, where he expounds his facts as if they were already familiar to his reader. In this version

<sup>110</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, pp. 377–81.

<sup>111</sup> *P.S.R.L.*, XXII.

of his theory, he does not mention the agreement 'with the Latins' as a reason for the fall of the Second Rome, but simply states that lack of faith had resulted in a losing struggle and that the victorious Turks had broken open the doors of the churches in captured Constantinople with 'axes' and 'scimitars'. 'Today the Third New Rome has arisen, and it is fitting that thou, the Tsar, shouldst keep it in the fear of God.'

The third epistle in which Filofey mentions the theory of Moscow the Third Rome is the most interesting of all. It was written to Misyur' Munekhin<sup>112</sup> in 1528. One passage in particular is strongly reminiscent of the Chronograph:

... although the children of Islam (*agariny vnutsi*) seized the Greek Empire, they did no harm to the faith and do not force the Greeks to renounce their faith, for the Roman Empire is indestructible, because our Lord was registered under the Roman power.

Filofey then reiterates his theory and again bases it on the prophecies of the Apocalypse. But his exposition is given in abbreviated form as though he were developing an argument familiar to the reader. In introducing the theme, he writes:

Let us say a few words of the present state of the Orthodox realm of our most illustrious and most high Tsar and Sovereign, who is the only tsar for Christians in the whole world and the guardian of the holy and divine altars of the Holy Apostolic Church, which is in the place of the Roman and the Byzantine [Church] and which is situated in the divinely protected town of Moscow, the Church of the Dormition of the Most Pure Mother of God which, unique in all the world, shines more brightly than the sun. Take into account all Christ-loving and God-loving men, how all Christian realms have come to an end and have been reduced to the single realm of our Sovereign, according to the Books of prophecy, that is to the realm of Russia: for two Romes have fallen, the Third stands and there shall be no Fourth.

He repeats that the flight of the Woman of the Apocalypse (i.e. the church) into the wilderness was caused by the 'water of unbelief' which the serpent cast out of his mouth. He concludes:

So you see, elect of God, how all Christian states are drowned because of the unbelievers. Only the sovereign of our realm alone stands by the Grace of Christ. It is fitting that the ruler should hold to this with the utmost vigilance and with prayer to God, not hoping in gold and riches which disappear, but trusting in God, the Giver of all things.

These quotations make it clear that the pathos of Filofey's original protest against the Latins, which is so marked in his first epistle, is relatively weaker in the third epistle. As in the Chronograph, two

<sup>112</sup> Malinin, *op. cit.*, appendix VII, pp. 37-47.

voices can be distinguished: one which simply records the facts and affirms the eternal values of Christianity; and another which continues to regret the inadequate faith of those who sought aid from the Latins. The focal point of Filofey's argument is that the first two Romes fell simply through lack of faith, and that the Third Rome, which was predicted in prophecy and had now come to pass in Moscow, must take care to preserve her faith.

This analysis of the three epistles suggests that they were written in a different order to that propounded by Malinin and his adherents. The fullest version of the theory of the Third Rome—and the one which is most consistent in its purely ecclesiastical tone—comes in the epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich, which was written in the hope of averting a possible secularisation of church and monastic lands in the territory of Pskov after the union with Moscow and after repeated instances of the confiscation of ecclesiastical property in Novgorod in 1499–1500. Filofey subsequently modifies his condemnation of the Greek church for its part in the Ferrara-Florentine council which is so strongly implied in his first epistle: this is already becoming evident in his epistle to Vasily III, which is also primarily a form of petition to the highest authority made necessary by the events of 1510–11. This modification was most probably due to Misyur' Munekhin's first-hand account of the true state of the Second Rome. This gave Filofey a more than theoretical insight into the whole question of the fall of Constantinople and the current position of the Orthodox church under the Turks, and he drew on it when compiling the Chronograph. Finally, in his epistle to Misyur' Munekhin, Filofey simply notes that a Third Rome has arisen, as was prophesied, that 'There will be no Fourth', and that the cause of all the disasters which befell the former Rome was lack of faith, which must be combatted by the Third Rome.

## VII

This article has tried to show that the epistle to Ivan Vasil'yevich was addressed to Ivan III and that all five of Malinin's objections to this supposition fail to withstand criticism.

The situation prevailing when Filofey first addressed the grand duke and tsar of Moscow are important for a correct interpretation of the significance of his theory of Moscow the Third Rome. An elder of the Eleazarov monastery in the 'Christ-loving, free land of Pskov',<sup>113</sup> he first took up his pen in an attempt to restrain Ivan III from a repetition of the confiscations carried out in 1478 and 1499.<sup>114</sup>

<sup>113</sup> Serebryansky, *Zhitiye prepodobnogo Yevfrosina Pskovskogo* . . . , p. 56.

<sup>114</sup> Malinin's suggestion that the immediate reason for the writing of the epistle was the attempts to confiscate certain church and monastic lands in the years 1535–8 (cf. Malinin, *op. cit.*, p. 646) refers to a situation which cannot even be compared with that of the

In this first epistle, which was written *circa* 1500, he sets out in detail the theory of Moscow the Third Rome, with the general outline and implications of which his contemporaries were already familiar. In the other two epistles in which he touches on the subject he dwells rather on such aspects of it as support his immediate aims in writing the epistles. All three epistles are dictated by the exigencies of the moment; and his epistle to Ivan III may be regarded as a historical document emanating from the monastic circles of which he was the spokesman. It reflected the struggle not for an abstract messianic ideal designed to further Muscovite policy,<sup>115</sup> but for an improvement in ecclesiastical life and some guarantee of security and independence for the Russian church from the arbitrary tendencies of the secular power, which were to become far more noticeable after Pskov was incorporated into Moscow. The 'new Constantine', Ivan III, long and stubbornly favoured the views of the non-possessors. But he finally decided the questions at issue in the spirit of Filofey's epistle, as though under the influence of the conception that as grand duke of Muscovy, the protector of Orthodoxy, he must in no way take part in the destruction of church property. Filofey's epistle was also taken heed of by those who were allotted the task of altering the *status quo* and of incorporating Pskov into the Muscovite state. Vasily III and Misyur' Munekhin, his trusted representative in Pskov, valued Filofey because they saw him as an ally in the difficult task of adapting the Pskovians to Muscovite ways. But Filofey's theory of Moscow the Third Rome, though undoubtedly pleasing to the son of Sophia Palaeologus, only served at this juncture to support his defence of the rights and property of the church and the purity of its ritual forms and moral life. His theory gained in popular significance<sup>116</sup> and took on certain messianic features under very different

beginning of the century. In the 1530s these attempts were the result of the influence of favourites on the actions of the government of Yelena Glinkaya. In the chronicle some of these confiscations were attributed to 'the slander of some cunning madman' (*P.S.R.L.*, VI, pp. 299–300). Josephians were in charge of ecclesiastical affairs: Metropolitan Daniil (22 February 1522–12 February 1539) and Metropolitan Iosaf (9 February 1539–3 January 1542) in Moscow, and Archbishop Makariy (March 1526–March 1543 when he became metropolitan of Moscow) in Novgorod. The decisions of the council of 1503–4 on this subject were on record and Filofey could scarcely have failed to quote them in support of his arguments if he had been writing in the 1530s. The situation at the beginning of the century was very different. Then it seemed that Pskov was immediately threatened by a repetition of the events in Novgorod. Malinin appears not to have entirely overlooked this situation which arose from the second confiscation of land in Novgorod over the years 1490–1500 (cf. Malinin, *op. cit.*, p. 630); but he failed to ascribe any significance to it, and it is almost as if the whole purpose of his book was to support the validity of his original theses, which D'yakonov had challenged when they first appeared. None of Malinin's critics and supporters except Ogloblin (cf. Ogloblin, *op. cit.*), appears to have reviewed the historical background of the formation of the theory of Moscow the Third Rome, as though they had all been hypnotised by the thousand pages of Malinin's somewhat prolix work.

<sup>115</sup> For supporters of this point of view see Chayev, *op. cit.*, pp. 10–13 and Ogloblin, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 *et seq.*

<sup>116</sup> Filofey's theories and their interconnection with the 'Tale of the White Cow'.

conditions, in the reign of Fyodor Ivanovich, with the establishment of the Muscovite Patriarchate in 1589.<sup>117</sup> But Filofey himself cannot be held responsible for this later and altogether more arrogant assertion of Moscow's importance as the Third Rome. What his own theory asserted was no more than the interdependence of church and state with the state guaranteeing the church's autonomy.

of Novgorod' (cf. N. K. Gudzy, *Istoriya drevney russkoy literatury*, VI ed., Moscow, 1956, pp. 290-1; Kazakova and Lur'ye, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-2; N. N. Rozov, 'Povest' o novgorodskom belom Klobuke kak pamyatnik obshcherusskoy publitsistiki XV veka' (*Trudy otdela drevne-russkoy literatury*, IX, Moscow-Leningrad, 1953); D. Strémoukhoff, 'La tiare de Saint Sylvestre et le Klobouk blanc' (*Revue des Etudes Slaves*, XXXIV, Paris, 1958)) are not within the scope of this article.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. 'Ulozhennaya Gramota 1589 goda' published in *Sobraniye gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, II, p. 97, col. 2.